

**Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed September 29, 2008.

**I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Claims 1, 16-19, 21-25, 27-28, and 33-41 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over the reference Rana, Ajaz and Collins, Albie, "Java Junction," Intelligent Enterprise, April 16, 2001 (hereinafter referred to as Rana) in view of the reference BEA Systems, Inc., WebLogic Server 6.1 Documentation, J2EE Connector Architecture (hereinafter referred to as the WebLogic Server 6.1 reference).

Claims 18, 22, 23, 24, and 27 were objected to because of informalities.

**II. Summary of Applicant's Response**

The present response amends Claims 1, 18, 22, 23, 24, and 27; and cancels Claims 28 and 33; leaving for the Examiner's consideration Claims 1, 16-19, 21-25, 27, and 34-41.

**III. Objections to the Claims**

In the Office Action, Claims 18, 22, 23, 24, and 27 were objected to because of informalities. Accordingly, Claims 18, 22, 23, 24, and 27 have been amended to correct these issues, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 (as amended) defines:

1. A computer readable storage medium storing instructions for improved implementation of a J2EE connector architecture on an application server, the instructions comprising:
  - a resource adapter for an Enterprise Information System;
  - a set of system-level contracts between the resource adapter and an application server;
  - a Common Client Interface capable of providing a client API for Java applications and development tools to access the resource adapter;
  - a connection manager on the application server capable of managing and maintaining size of a pool of connections to the Enterprise Information System, wherein the connection manager matches a request for a new connection to the Enterprise Information System, through the resource adapter, with an existing and available managed connection in the pool of connections, and wherein the connection manager creates a plurality of managed connections when an existing and available managed connection is not found, wherein the connection manager creates each of the plurality of managed connections using an initiating principal and client request information contained in the request for a new connection;

a set of packaging and development interfaces that provide the ability for resource adapters to plug into J2EE applications in a modular manner; and  
a deployment descriptor containing a configuration element for the resource adapter, the configuration element allowing a user to override default deployment values for the resource adapter.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Rana in view of the WebLogic Server 6.1 reference.

Rana discloses that the connection management contract requires the resource adapter and application server to cooperate so that the resource adapter is responsible for creating physical links to an EIS. The responsibility of managing a pool of such connections lies in the hands of an application server. Application components request connections to an EIS through a resource adapter. The resource adapters delegate all such requests to the application server. The application server, on receiving a connection creation request, performs a lookup in its pool of connections. If there is no connection in the pool that can satisfy the connection request, the application server requests the resource adapter to create a new physical link to the underlying EIS. If the application server finds a matching connection in the pool, then it uses it to satisfy the connection request. If a new instance of a physical connection to the EIS is created, the application server adds the new instance to the pool. In either case, the application server returns the connection handle back to the resource adapter, which passes it on to the application component. (Page 4).

Claim 1 defines that the connection manager creates a plurality of managed connections when an existing and available managed connection is not found. Claim 1 has been further amended to define that the connection manager creates each of the plurality of managed connections using an initiating principal and client request information contained in the request for a new connection.

In the Office Action, it was recognized that Rana does not disclose that the connection manager creates a plurality of managed connections when an existing and available managed connection is not found. It was further recognized that Rana does not disclose that the connection manager creates each of the plurality of managed connections using an initiating principal and client request information contained in the request for a new connection.

However, it was asserted that the WebLogic Server 6.1 reference discloses that the connection manager creates a plurality of managed connections when an existing and available managed connection is not found. It was further asserted that the WebLogic Server 6.1 reference discloses that the connection manager creates each of the plurality of managed connections using an initiating principal and client request information contained in the request for a new connection.

In making the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the WebLogic Server 6.1 reference was qualified as a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a). Applicant respectfully traverses the application of this

reference. For 35 U.S.C. 102(a) to apply, the reference must have a publication date earlier in time than the effective filing date of the application, and must not be Applicant's own work.

Applicant respectfully submits together with the present Response a Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. §1.132, signed by Richard Mousseau, one of the inventors of the present Application No. 10/617,909, stating that Richard Mousseau, together with Prasenjit Mukherjee and Deborah C. June, invented the subject matter disclosed in the WebLogic Server 6.1 reference, to the extent relied on in the rejections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention described in the WebLogic Server 6.1 reference, to the extent relied on in rejecting the claims, is Applicant's own work and does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(a). In light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the WebLogic Server 6.1 reference be disqualified as prior art and that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### Claim 27

Claim 27 (as amended) defines:

1. A computer readable storage medium for improved implementation of a J2EE connector architecture on an application server, comprising:

a resource adapter for an Enterprise Information System;

a deployment descriptor, wherein the deployment descriptor contains a configuration element for the resource adapter, wherein the configuration element allows a user to override default deployment values for the resource adapter;

a set of system-level contracts between the resource adapter and an application server, the set including a security management contract;

a password converter tool capable of being used with the security management contract to encrypt any passwords in the deployment descriptor, wherein the password converter tool parses an existing deployment descriptor containing non-encrypted passwords and creates a new deployment descriptor containing encrypted passwords;

a Common Client Interface capable of providing a client API for Java applications and development tools to access the resource adapter; and

a set of packaging and development interfaces that provide the ability for resource adapters to plug into J2EE applications in a modular manner.

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Rana in view of the WebLogic Server 6.1 reference. Claim 27 was amended to include features previously presented in Claim 28.

Rana discloses that the security contract between the application server and the resource adapter enables secure access to an EIS. Similar to the transaction contract, the security contract between the application server and the resource adapter lets the application server hook in security-specific details at connection creation time. Creating a new physical connection to an EIS requires a signon to an EIS. An EIS

signon and subsequent interaction with an EIS requires proper authentication, authorization, and secure communication between the application server and the EIS. The security contract specification of the connector architecture addresses these issues by adding EIS integration-specific security details to the security requirements specified in the broader J2EE specification. A notable point about the security contract of the connector architecture is that it is independent of an authentication mechanism. It does not require that a specific authentication mechanism, such as Kerberos, be supported by an application server. (Page 5).

Claim 27 defines a password converter tool capable of being used with the security management contract to encrypt any passwords in the deployment descriptor. Claim 27 has been further amended to define that the password converter tool parses an existing deployment descriptor containing non-encrypted passwords and creates a new deployment descriptor containing encrypted passwords.

In the Office Action, it was recognized that Rana does not disclose a password converter tool capable of being used with the security management contract to encrypt any passwords in the deployment descriptor. It was further recognized that Rana does not disclose that the password converter tool parses an existing deployment descriptor containing non-encrypted passwords and creates a new deployment descriptor containing encrypted passwords.

However, it was asserted that the WebLogic Server 6.1 reference disclosed that a password converter tool capable of being used with the security management contract to encrypt any passwords in the deployment descriptor. It was further asserted that the WebLogic Server 6.1 reference discloses that the password converter tool parses an existing deployment descriptor containing non-encrypted passwords and creates a new deployment descriptor containing encrypted passwords.

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. As described above, applicant respectfully requests that the WebLogic Server 6.1 reference be disqualified as prior art against the present application. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 27, as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 16-19, 21-25, 28, and 33-41**

Claims 28 and 33 have been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of these claims. Claims 16-19, 21-25, and 34-41 depend from and include all of the features of claims 1 or 27. Claims 16-19, 21-25, and 34-41 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Application No: 10/617,909  
Office Action mailed: September 29, 2008  
Reply to Office Action dated: December 1, 2008

**V. Conclusion**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 1, 2008

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/  
Thomas K. Plunkett  
Reg. No. 57,253

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Customer No. 80548

Attorney Docket No.: ORACL-01076US1  
tplunkett/oracl/1076us1/1076us1\_Reply\_092908

- 11 -